



SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES
AND COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRETARY OF THE ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN
G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE HENSEL AND SENATOR
JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN, AND
FRANCIS P. CARR

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
PURSUANT TO
S. Res. 189

PART 9

APRIL 28, 1954

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota	JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas
MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine	HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	ALTON A. LENNON, North Carolina

RICHARD J. O'MELIA, *General Counsel*

WALTER L. REYNOLDS, *Chief Clerk*

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota, *Chairman*

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

RAY H. JENKINS, *Chief Counsel*

THOMAS R. PREWITT, *Assistant Counsel*

ROBERT A. COLLIER, *Assistant Counsel*

SOLIS HORWITZ, *Assistant Counsel*

CHARLES A. MANER, *Secretary*

CONTENTS

	Page
Index-----	I
Testimony of Stevens, Hon. Robert T., Secretary, Department of the Army-----	338
	III

SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES AND COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRETARY OF THE ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE HENSEL AND SENATOR JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN, AND FRANCIS P. CARR

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:45 a. m., pursuant to recess, in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, Senator Karl E. Mundt, chairman, presiding.

Present: Senators Karl E. Mundt, Republican, South Dakota; Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican, Illinois; Charles E. Potter, Republican, Michigan; Henry C. Dworshak, Republican, Idaho; John L. McClellan, Democrat, Arkansas; Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, Washington; and Stuart Symington, Democrat, Missouri.

Also present: Ray H. Jenkins, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Thomas R. Prewitt, assistant counsel; and Ruth Y. Watt, chief clerk.

Principal participants: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, a United States Senator from the State of Wisconsin; Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Francis P. Carr, executive director of the subcommittee; Hon. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army; John G. Adams, counselor to the Army; H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense; Joseph N. Welch, special counsel for the Army; James D. St. Clair, special counsel for the Army; and Frederick P. Bryan, counsel to H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Senator MUNDT. The committee will come to order, please.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Do you have a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. Not a point of order, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to suggest that we have identified all of the generals and other officers here and know why they are here because I think the committee will take more and more criticism for holding up the work of the Army by this investigation.

Senator MUNDT. That is not a point of order and the Chair does not propose to go around the audience identifying our guests and they have a right to be here as long as they refrain from manifestations of approval or disapproval.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy?

Senator McCARTHY. I do think that regardless of whether it is a point of order or not, I don't think it is a point of order but I do think that we should know just how many generals and colonels are ordered over here by the civilians in the Pentagon; why they are here and not doing their work in the Army.

Senator MUNDR. If you have a question to ask the Secretary along that line, which you consider relevant, you may ask it on your own time.

Senator McCARTHY. I will ask that.

Senator MUNDR. I will not define the members of the audience.

We left off, I believe, with Senator McClellan having been the last member of the committee to ask questions, and so next in line for 10 minutes, if he cares to consume it, will be Senator Dirksen of Illinois.

TESTIMONY OF HON. ROBERT T. STEVENS, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY—Resumed

Senator DIRKSEN. For the moment, Mr. Chairman, I waive my right to ask questions.

Senator MUNDR. Senator Jackson of Washington.

Senator JACKSON. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, at the last hour on yesterday when I had the turn at asking questions, I called to your attention the fact that I believed that it was important that the basic issues in this controversy be resolved, pinpointed so that we could get a better picture of the specific areas of disagreement, as I understand it from reading the charges and the countercharges, statements that have been released to the press and so on.

With that in mind, I wish to pursue the previous line of questions and once again I put these propositions to you to have your answer whether in your opinion they are true or false. That is bearing in mind that the perjury statutes of course, have application if these same statements that have been made publicly are repeated under oath by the same parties, it would appear obvious that there might be a violation of Federal statutes.

The first question, it is alleged in a memorandum from Frank Carr to Senator McCarthy dated October 2, 1953, that, and I quote:

Mr. Stevens stated that he, Mr. Schine, should take his initial basic training and that he should complete his training and that he, Stevens, would be able to use Schine to his own advantage in the Army.

He stated that he was—

very interested in any question of Communists or Communist infiltration, and that Dave would be of great assistance to him if after basic he could attend some special type of school in the Army and report to Stevens his observations based on his experience as an investigator in the Communist field.

End of quotation.

Did you ever make that statement, or hear anyone in the Army make that statement; if as far as you are concerned, then, is that allegation true or false?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, Senator Jackson, first of all I have got to answer this one, you might say, in two pieces.

On the question of whether or not I am interested in communism or Communist infiltration; of course I am and I have done and will continue to do everything I can in opposition to that.

Now, with respect to the balance of the statement, I stated that Schine would have to complete his basic training. I said that it was conceivable that after he had completed his basic training he might qualify for a security or intelligence school and if he did, it could further be conceivable that he would have to do with communism or Communist infiltration.

I recall having made some general observation of that type.

Senator JACKSON. Well, let me put another proposition to you in connection with the quotation from this quote from the memorandum of October 2, and see if there is any conflict. In the Army report on the same date, and this is your Army report, it is stated and I quote—that would be the Army list of the original Army list of charges, and refer to that of October 2. Do you have that?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Senator JACKSON. Now, in that report, and I quote:

Mr. Cohn stated it was desirable to have Mr. Schine available for consultation with a staff of the subcommittee to complete certain work. The Secretary did not agree with the suggestions, and pointed out that Mr. Schine should follow the same procedures for assignment as any other private in the Army.

That is the end of the quote.

I think you will agree, Mr. Stevens, there is a direct conflict between these two memorandums written on the same date. In the subcommittee memorandum, you offered a special assignment; I mean that is the first memorandum that I quoted from, and it is alleged that you offered a special assignment for Private Schine. In the Army memorandum, the one I just read, Mr. Cohn requested a special assignment for Mr. Schine, and you flatly turned him down. Which of these memorandums is true and which is false?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, in the Army memorandums there, the situation was that Mr. Cohn wanted Mr. Schine detailed to New York City without any training, and of course I turned that down. I said that he would have to take his basic training. I mentioned, as I did before, the possibility that he might conceivably apply for and be accepted by a security or an intelligence school later on, but I certainly made no commitment with respect to that, either, at any time.

Senator JACKSON. Well, in your opinion, is the Army memorandum, the last one I quoted from, true?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator JACKSON. And as I understand it, then, in your opinion the memorandum of October 2 from Frank Carr to Senator McCarthy is not entirely true?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator JACKSON. You agree with part of it?

Secretary STEVENS. I agree with part of it.

Senator JACKSON. What part do you disagree with?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I disagree—

Senator JACKSON. You can refer back to it if you have it there before you.

Secretary STEVENS. I disagree with the inference that I stated a month before Dave Schine was in the Army that I had any idea of what his—that I was making any commitment as to what his future course in the Army was going to be, because his future course in the Army was going to depend on his basic training, and he was going to take the same as any other boy and be handled in the same way.

I gathered an inference in this memorandum of Mr. Carr's that is different from anything that I had in mind.

Senator JACKSON. The next question: In the Army report of January 9, 1954, if you will find that, it is alleged that Mr. Cohn attempted to get Private Schine out of KP on Sunday, the 10th of January. Mr. Cohn has stated on Meet the Press on March 14, in answer to a question by Jack Bell, of the Associated Press, in discussing this KP incident, and I quote:

That was a Sunday, and there had been an agreement in advance that he could use that day to work on this report. They reneged on that agreement, and that was the only purpose in communicating with the Army. I just want to say this, if I may. At no time did I or anyone else on the committee ever suggest that he should be released from KP or any other unpleasant duty a draftee had to go through, and I don't wish to make such a request.

End of the quotation by Mr. Cohn in response to a question put by Mr. Jack Bell on the program, Meet the Press, on March 14 of this year.

First let me ask you if you know anything about that agreement that Mr. Cohn refers to.

Secretary STEVENS. I have heard about it, although with respect to the KP incidents, I don't have any firsthand knowledge of that, Senator Jackson.

Senator JACKSON. Then is it true or false, as far as you know, that Mr. Cohn ever requested Private Schine to be relieved of KP?

Senator MUNDT. The Senator's time has expired.
You may answer the question.

Secretary STEVENS. Will the reporter read the question, please?
(The question was read by the reporter.)

Secretary STEVENS. As I said, Senator Jackson, I do not have knowledge of that first hand. I think I know the answer to the question. I am not sure I could testify to it, Mr. Chairman, as of my own personal knowledge.

Senator JACKSON. General Ryan would have that information?

Senator MUNDT. Senator Potter.

Senator POTTER. Mr. Secretary, the questions I am about to ask will also be asked of Mr. Adams and Mr. Cohn.

Referring to the memorandum dated December 9, 1953, from Mr. Cohn to Senator McCarthy, it states, and I will quote:

John Adams said today that, following up the idea about investigating the Air Force, he had gotten specific knowledge for us about an Air Force base where there were a large number of homosexuals. He said that he would trade us that information if we would tell him what the next Army project was that we would investigate.

I ask you this question, Mr. Secretary: Did John Adams give this information to you; that he told you about the large number of sex perverts in the Air Force?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator POTTER. Did Mr. Adams say to Mr. Cohn or Senator McCarthy in your presence anything about sex perverts or subversives of any kind in the Air Force?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator POTTER. You say that knowing that the charge has been made—

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator POTTER. Not only with regard to Mr. Adams but you yourself, in the memorandum of Friday, November 6, 1953, when they stated that you asked, and I quote:

Mr. Stevens asked that we hold up our public hearings on the Army. He suggested we go after the Navy, Air Force, and Defense Department instead. We said first of all we had no evidence warranting an investigation of these other departments. Adams said not to worry about that, because there was plenty of dirt there, and they would furnish us the leads—

“they” meaning the Department of the Army, I suppose.

Mr. Stevens thought this was the answer to his problem.

You are under oath, as you know. What is your answer to the question, first as to whether you heard Mr. Adams make that suggestion to Senator McCarthy and Mr. Cohn?

Secretary STEVENS. I did not.

Senator POTTER. You didn't hear Mr. Adams make that suggestion?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator POTTER. Were you there all during the meeting that took place on November 6?

Secretary STEVENS. Practically the whole time.

Senator POTTER. What is your answer to the question as to whether you made any suggestion that they might go after the Department of Defense or the Navy or the Air Force?

Secretary STEVENS. My answer to that is that it is unequivocally untrue.

Senator POTTER. Now, Mr. Secretary, I wish to refer to the memorandum dated January 14, 1954, to Senator McCarthy from Mr. Cohn. I would like to refer to the last paragraph, and I wish to quote:

Adams said this was the last chance for me to arrange that law partnership in New York which he wanted. One would think he was kidding, but his persistence on this subject makes it clear he is serious. He said he had turned down a job in industry at \$17,500 and needed a guaranty of \$25,000 from a law firm.

That is the end of the paragraph.

The question I wish to ask, Mr. Secretary: Did Mr. Adams contact you at any time suggesting that he leave Government service and secure private employment or go into private law practice?

Secretary STEVENS. Along in November, I would say, Senator Potter, Mr. Adams did tell me of the fact that he had a possible opportunity to go into business in New York. He hadn't been on his new job in the Department of the Army very long, and he was therefore somewhat reluctant to give it any serious consideration, but he brought it to me and we talked about it. He told me at that time that if he ever did leave the Government service, he would expect to go into business. In other words, he said that he had never practiced law, and if he left the Government he would take a job in business and would not be looking around for a job in a law firm.

Senator PORTER. Did he mention to you that he had discussed this with Mr. Cohn?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes; I think he mentioned something—I don't know whether it was then or some other time. I think he mentioned at some time—

Senator PORTER. Did he mention to you that Mr. Cohn was to aid him in securing a position in industry, in business, or in a law partnership?

Secretary STEVENS. No; he did not. What I gathered was that there was a certain amount of, shall we call it, banter or something like that, about a law business.

Senator POTTER. And this so-called banter had taken place in your presence?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator POTTER. Did you ever hear Mr. Adams suggest to Mr. Cohn that private practice would be looked upon with favor at this time?

Secretary STEVENS. I never did.

Senator POTTER. Your information, then, relates to the information that you secured from Mr. Adams, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no other questions at this time. However, I would like to make one comment; that in my opinion the hearings are dragging on pretty slowly, and at the rate we are going now we will not be out of here until Labor Day. It is my suggestion that unless we can move much faster we have night sessions. I can think of no better way to speed up the hearing.

Senator MUNDT. I wish you could think of a better way.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions at this time. I would like to comment, however, on what Senator Potter has just said. We have about six principals here and a good many other witnesses. They are being added to as additional testimony comes in, pictures and problems. It looks to me like we probably will be here all summer. I would hope that everybody now seems to understand the position of Mr. Stevens and the position of those opposing him—I would hope that the chairman and counsel would keep their questions as relevant as possible and make it possible for us to get additional witnesses on the stand and off so these hearings will be closed at the earliest opportunity. I completely agree with the comments of my colleague from Michigan.

As to night sessions, anything and everything that will expedite these hearings I would be for.

That is all I have to say at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Dworshak.

Senator DWORSHAK. No questions, Mr. Chairman, but I want—

Senator MUNDT. I hope you have not been intimidated by our colleagues.

Senator DWORSHAK. I am concerned, as the other members of this subcommittee that the hearings be expedited as much as possible so we can go on to other important business.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Welch.

Mr. WELCH. Nothing at the moment.

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy or Mr. Cohn?

Senator McCARTHY. First may I say I heartily endorse Senator Potter's suggestion of having night sessions so that we can get through with this as quickly as possible.

Mr. Stevens, I note we have a two-star general to the left of Mr. Hensel, and we have a full colonel behind him, and we have other full colonels to his right, and we have got a sizable number around you. You have General Young and General Back and General Reber, and I would like to know are these men here upon your orders?

Secretary STEVENS. They are here in case they may be needed, in connection with getting the facts in this case out before this committee.

Senator McCARTHY. I wonder if you would do this for me: Have one of your aides give us the names of all of the military personnel, and what their jobs are in the Pentagon, and why they are here. It looks like a great waste of manpower to me and if they are needed, of course, to give you information, certainly they should be here. But rather than take the time now of going over it one by one, could you have one of your lawyers make a list of their jobs in the Pentagon and their job here today?

Secretary STEVENS. Do you want me to identify the officers? I will be glad to do it now.

Senator McCARTHY. I would like to have one of your counsel here give me a list.

Now, going on to the next question, what was John Adams' job with our committee; what was his assignment?

Secretary STEVENS. John Adams' job was with the Department of the Army, and he was the counselor for the Department of the Army.

Senator McCARTHY. And what was he assigned to do with our committee?

Secretary STEVENS. He was assigned as a liaison between the Department of the Army and your committee.

Senator McCARTHY. Did you tell Mr. Adams that you would like to have the hearings suspended?

Secretary STEVENS. I told Mr. Adams I wanted to cooperate with the committee to the limit of his and my ability.

Senator McCARTHY. And after you told him, did you tell him you wanted the hearings suspended?

Secretary STEVENS. I never remember telling Mr. Adams that.

Senator McCARTHY. Is it correct that you did want the hearings suspended?

Secretary STEVENS. We have covered this pretty fully, Senator McCarthy, and I will be glad to cover it again.

Senator McCARTHY. You seem to cover it differently each day.

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think it is different, I am very clear about it.

Senator McCARTHY. Did you want the hearings suspended or did you keep it a secret?

Secretary STEVENS. I wanted the Army to have the right to take over this investigation at Fort Monmouth, and run it down, and to make reports to you, and for your investigation to continue on.

Senator McCARTHY. Did you want us to suspend our public hearings?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator, I have covered this so much, do you want me to keep going over it again?

Senator McCARTHY. I would like to have you answer this question.

Secretary STEVENS. Senator, I am trying to the limit of my ability to get before this committee the truth, and I think if you will help me to do that, we can get along a little faster. But I find myself beginning to be confused the way you ask these questions.

Senator McCARTHY. Well, it is a pretty simple question.

Secretary STEVENS. And I think I have testified so fully on the thing that it is all a matter of record right now.

Senator McCARTHY. May I say—

Secretary STEVENS. I would like to suggest that we go back over the record, and get out the answers, and that is the testimony.

Mr. JENKINS. May I make a suggestion?

Senator McCARTHY. Not on my time.

Mr. JENKINS. The question seems to be a direct question, with respect to a simple matter, and we will save time if the Secretary, even though it is repetitious, merely answers the question, and then give such explanation as he desires. And I merely make that as a suggestion in furtherance of the plan of Senator Potter to speed these hearings.

Senator McCARTHY. An excellent suggestion.

Secretary STEVENS. I said I have testified.

Senator McCARTHY. Pardon me.

Secretary STEVENS. I have testified as I recall it that I thought that the Fort Monmouth hearings, the way they were being conducted, had served their purpose and I would like to have the Army carry on the hearings and carry on the investigation and make the reports to you.

Senator McCARTHY. Putting it in other words, you wanted us to quit and the Army do the job?

Secretary STEVENS. I would like—not have your investigation quit, but let us handle the business of running down the cases that we were in the process of running down.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Secretary, did you want the hearings suspended?

Secretary STEVENS. Did I want them suspended?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes.

Secretary STEVENS. I wanted the type of hearing that you were conducting suspended, yes, sir.

Senator McCARTHY. You wanted our hearings suspended, did you not?

Secretary STEVENS. I wanted to have the type of hearing that you were conducting suspended.

Senator McCARTHY. Now you say the type. Did you want us to continue holding hearings on a different type of hearing?

Secretary STEVENS. If you had held the type of hearing which would have given the American people and the people in the United States Army a more accurate evaluation of what the situation was at Fort Monmouth, I would have had no objection whatever.

Senator McCARTHY. But you did want the hearings we were holding suspended. Is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. Hearings of that type, yes.

Senator McCARTHY. Did you tell Mr. Adams you wanted those hearings suspended?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall having told him that.

Senator McCARTHY. You kept it a secret from him?

Secretary STEVENS. I didn't keep anything a secret from him, as far as I know, but I don't recall having discussed that particular point.

Senator McCARTHY. You mean to say you never talked to Mr. Adams about the wisdom of getting the hearings suspended, or a different type of hearings held?

Secretary STEVENS. I say that I don't recall specific discussion on it. It was my idea that these hearings were getting out of hand, and creating a very unfair impression in the minds of the public, and of the Army, as to what the facts were at Fort Monmouth.

Senator McCARTHY. Did you discuss that with John Adams, Bob?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, I discussed that with John Adams.

Senator McCARTHY. Of course, you did.

Secretary STEVENS. Of course.

Senator McCARTHY. And one of his jobs was to try to get the hearings suspended, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. No, I would not say that was correct. I would say our collective job was to handle the Army's cooperation with the committee in the best way we possibly could, but that we also had a responsibility to make sure that the news that went out to the public bore some real good relationship to the facts.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Secretary, just so that you will be aware of what you previously testified to, may I say that it appears now that the testimony is going to be so diametrically opposite that I think this committee will have no choice but to submit this entire record to the Justice Department, having all witnesses keep that in mind, and somebody either has been or will be guilty of perjury; and it is not up for me to decide who. Just so that you will be aware of your previous testimony, page 442 of the record, Mr. Jenkins' question—did you have something to say—Mr. Jenkins' question:

Then what you are saying is that you did not ask the Senator to stop his investigation of Fort Monmouth, but merely to suspend it and give you a chance to carry on. And then if you failed, to take over again; is that correct?

Answer: "That is correct."

Is that your testimony today?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy, I think you know what my testimony is. I have been over it and over it and over it.

Senator McCARTHY. Well, let me put the question very simply: Did you ask me to suspend the hearings of Communist infiltration at the radar laboratories?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy, I have been over it and over it.

Senator McCARTHY. Just tell me.

Secretary STEVENS. If this committee wants, I will continue to go over it.

Senator McCARTHY. Just tell me why, yes or no.

Secretary STEVENS. I said I thought the type of hearing you were holding had served its purpose, and that the Army should have the right to carry on and run these things down themselves, and make progress reports to you, and that your investigation should not be suspended, and that we would do the job to the best of our ability.

Senator McCARTHY. Have you made any progress reports since the hearings of Communist infiltration were suspended?

Secretary STEVENS. I think we have been in close touch with your committee at all times.

Senator McCARTHY. Have you made any progress reports to me?

Secretary STEVENS. When?

Senator McCARTHY. Since the hearings were suspended.

Secretary STEVENS. What date are you talking about?

Senator McCARTHY. Any time, any day.

Secretary STEVENS. I think we have been in close touch. John Adams has been in close touch with your staff right straight along, and the record will bear that out.

Senator McCARTHY. The question is: Have you made a progress report? In other words, have you told us how many people you have suspended, since we suspended the hearings?

Secretary STEVENS. I have testified to that in public.

Senator McCARTHY. In other words, the only progress report you gave was the progress report on Mr. Jenkins' cross-examination; is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. I wouldn't say that is the only progress report.

Senator McCARTHY. Have you given us this progress report that you are talking about?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy, I didn't give you progress reports personally, but I knew that John Adams was in close touch with your staff, and any information that was available, that you wanted, that we could properly give, would be supplied.

Senator McCARTHY. Maybe you can give us a progress report, then, today. Since the hearings have been suspended, how many security risks have you suspended from the radar laboratories, if any?

Secretary STEVENS. I will have to check that, Senator McCarthy.

Senator McCARTHY. How long will it take you to check that?

Secretary STEVENS. I think that we have got the information available here, with one of our people.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, Senator Jackson asked for that information, and we are making it available as swiftly as possible.

Senator MUNDT. The testimony, when it comes, will be read into the record by Mr. Stevens under oath. If he has it now, fine; and if not, when will you have it?

Mr. WELCH. I am under the impression it can be furnished to the committee at this moment; am I correct in that, Mr. St. Clair?

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman—

Senator McCARTHY. Just a moment.

Senator JACKSON. A point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. It is taking up my time.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Jackson has a point of order. All points of order, may I suggest to the timekeeper, should be done while time is out.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order that I wish to make is that inasmuch as I had requested, as of yesterday, that the Army submit to the committee a report as to the exact situation with reference to the suspensions at Fort Monmouth, that at the conclusion of the interrogation of Mr. Stevens by Senator McCarthy, I believe it appropriate, if the report is not too lengthy, that it be read into the record at the conclusion of the interrogation.

Senator MUNDT. That should be satisfactory to you, Senator McCarthy, because it will not then come out of your time.

Senator McCARTHY. Very good.

Is that progress report ready now, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. We have the report that Senator Jackson asked for here.

Senator McCARTHY. How about the one I asked for? How many people have you suspended since our investigation into Communist infiltration at the radar laboratories? You suspended 35 while that investigation was in progress. I wonder if that is all you have suspended.

Secretary STEVENS. I think I testified the other day, Senator, that we suspended 6 prior to October 8, which was the former date of the opening of your executive committee hearing, and 29 thereafter. Is that what you wanted, sir, 29 thereafter?

Senator McCARTHY. Let's get the dates correct, Bob, if we may. The date of the first hearing was when, Roy?

Mr. COHN. August 31.

Senator McCARTHY. August 31. The investigation started long before that. Is it not correct that you had suspended no one until we commenced the investigation?

Secretary STEVENS. I would have to check that up and find out. As I say, my understanding of when your hearings started was on October 8, although I know that you had work going on before that. I do not know when it started.

Senator McCARTHY. The question, Mr. Secretary, is how many did you suspend—

Senator MUNDT. The Senator's time has expired.

Senator McCARTHY. I am sorry.

Senator MUNDT. We revert back to counsel. I think we agreed that you might have a statement to read at this time in response to Mr. Jackson's question?

Secretary STEVENS. Would you like to go first, sir, or shall I read this?

Mr. JENKINS. It does not make a bit of difference to me, Mr. Secretary. Suit your own convenience.

Senator MUNDT. You may read it now, and so that we may know clearly what is before us, will either Senator Jackson restate the request or could the reporter read it or could Mr. Stevens read it so we know exactly what is being responded to at this time?

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, just a question. I would like to know how many Senators have this report. If only Mr. Jackson has it, and when he got it. I would like to have a copy of it.

Senator MUNDT. I believe the report was prepared last night, and it is to be read to the committee.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I just received a copy of it about 3 minutes ago because I requested it. Inasmuch as I had requested it as such yesterday and it had been understood it would be made available at this hearing, I think it ought to be read in the record. I assume that the Department of the Army may have extra copies.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman—

Senator MUNDT. The Chair is simply endeavoring to find out now exactly what this report is being read for—in response to what?

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to correct my previous statement. I received this from the committee staff, and the committee staff has informed me they received it from Colonel BeLieu.

Senator MUNDT. This morning?

Senator JACKSON. This morning. I received it within 5 minutes.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Stevens, will you tell us, as you begin, the nature of it and the purpose of it, in response to what question? We want to know what the question was.

Secretary STEVENS. The heading of this is "Fort Monmouth Cases."

Senator MUNDT. You may read it, and then we will interrogate from there.

Senator JACKSON. May I read the question that I asked?

Senator MUNDT. Yes, I think it would be well if we knew exactly the reason for the question.

Senator JACKSON. Let me read the question from the record of yesterday that I put to Mr. Stevens.

Senator MUNDT. That will be helpful.

Senator JACKSON. Which is upon the reports that he is about to read. This is on page 582.

Senator JACKSON. I wonder this, Mr. Stevens: Would you be good enough to give to the committee a statement without reference to the individuals' names, the general nature of the allegations against them, and a summary of the action taken to date by the Army—for example, whether any of them have been reinstated, whether some of them have been fired, how long it will be before there is a determination.

I make this request of you, Mr. Stevens, because this matter has been kicked around in the newspapers, it has been discussed here in the committee; the American people, I think, are pretty confused. No one knows the true nature of the situation with reference to these thirty-five people.

I do believe that it would be helpful if the Army could submit a statement outlining the present status of the Fort Monmouth situation as to the suspended personnel for the open hearing. I think it might be well to give to the counsel of the committee also a classified statement which could not be released, but only for their guidance and for information, if such were necessary, because of classified material.

Secretary STEVENS. Senator, we would like to submit anything that you want and, within the limits of the Presidential directives that apply, we will do so.

I think that is it.

Senator MUNDT. This, then, is the unclassified statement?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of following the regular procedure, I would think that in view of the fact that this is a question by Mr. Jackson, it should wait until his time comes around. I am so low here on the totem pole, it takes so long to get my 10 minutes, I do not think we should—

Senator MUNDT. The Chair suggests to counsel that he propound the question on his unlimited time, and then it will not deprive anybody of time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, by way of further cross examination, you have testified, as we understand it, that you retained Mr. Adams as of approximately October 1.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And you assigned him to the special duties that would ordinarily devolve upon a liaison officer between you and the committee?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir. He was Department counselor, Mr. Jenkins, and that was one of his jobs. He had other jobs, of course.

Mr. JENKINS. That was one of his principal jobs, as we understand it, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. At that time you had known for approximately 1 month that the McCarthy committee was investigating the infiltration of Communists and subversives in the First Army area, including Fort Monmouth, had you not?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And as of the date of your retention of Mr. Adams you, as I understand your testimony, had made overtures to the McCarthy committee to suspend their investigations and not to conduct

any hearings, and to allow the Army to carry on that work; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Did you say before Mr. Adams came with me?

Mr. JENKINS. I say that—my question is this: Please state whether or not as of October 1, the date of your retention of Mr. Adams as counsel, you had known that the McCarthy committee was investigating the infiltration of Communists and subversives as bad security risks in the First Army area, including Fort Monmouth? Is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You had discussed that situation with Senator McCarthy and his staff, had you not, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. On several occasions prior to October 1, the date of Adams' retention?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand your testimony, you had as of October 1, that is, prior to October 1, made overtures to the McCarthy committee to suspend that investigation and to allow you to do it?

Secretary STEVENS. No sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You had not?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, did you as of October 1 want that investigation by the McCarthy Committee suspended?

Secretary STEVENS. Actually, Mr. Jenkins, the Fort Monmouth investigation, so far as I am concerned, started on the 8th of October, and I knew relatively little about it, if anything, as of October 1.

Mr. JENKINS. But, as I understand it, you learned in Montana from a newspaper account that Senator McCarthy was investigating three security risks in the First Army area; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. But not at Fort Monmouth, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. All right. Is Fort Monmouth included in the First Army area?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Then if he was investigating the subject, infiltration of bad security risks in the First Army area, that would include Fort Monmouth; would it not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, it would.

Mr. JENKINS. And you knew in Montana that he had three men under investigation in the First Army area; did you not?

Secretary STEVENS. Two men and one woman.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well. Three persons. You did come back and you did initiate a conference with Senator McCarthy and you did discuss his alleged—his activities in the investigation of those three persons; did you not?

Secretary STEVENS. I came back, Mr. Jenkins, to get information about what the trouble was, and tried to get to work on it with him.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you do what I asked of you, Mr. Secretary? Did you do that? You understand the question. If you don't, I will repeat it: Did you discuss, when you came back from Montana, with Senator McCarthy or any member of his staff, these three persons about whom you had read in Montana?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, I did.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well. Did you at that time suggest to Senator McCarthy that you had an agency equipped to investigate them and that you would take the matter in hand yourself and conduct an investigation of those three persons?

Secretary STEVENS. Of course, I told him we would investigate it, but I didn't say anything about his not investigating them, either.

Mr. JENKINS. But you told him you would do so?

Secretary STEVENS. Oh, sure. You bet you.

Mr. JENKINS. You said nothing about his washing his hands, so to speak, of that work and allowing you to carry it on?

Secretary STEVENS. This was the first contact I had with him.

Mr. JENKINS. We understand. At any time between that first contact about the 7th or 8th of October, and the date of retention of Adams, did you talk to Senator McCarthy on other occasions?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. That is, that 3-week period?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. About the investigation of the First Army area?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you at any time during that period suggest or intimate that you were perfectly capable and equipped to carry it on and would he please step out of the picture and allow you to do it?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir. I always suggested that we were well equipped to carry it on, but I never suggested his stepping out of the picture.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you want him to step out of the picture?

Secretary STEVENS. No.

Mr. JENKINS. And allow you to do that work?

Secretary STEVENS. The problem arose over the Fort Monmouth investigation, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You appreciated the fact that his work in investigating the First Army area, including Fort Monmouth, was somewhat a duplication of your work, did you not, Mr. Secretary? Is that right?

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair request, very firmly this time, that the photographers abide by the committee rule to take any pictures they are going to take in a kneeling position or sitting down. There are a great many complaints from the television audience and from the television people that all the cameras are getting are the backs and the backs of the heads of a lot of agitated photographers.

May the Chair say that last night for a while, for the first time, he had a chance to see part of the television playback, and I want to confirm the legitimacy of those complaints. I looked at the backs of a lot of heads.

We will just have to ask those photographers sitting in front of the witness to remain seated when they take their pictures.

Secretary STEVENS. Unfortunately, due to the fact of all the pictures, I missed that question, Mr. Jenkins.

Senator MUNDT. We will ask Mr. Jenkins to repeat it.

I simply wanted to be sure this time that our photographer friends complied with the ruling.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you feel that the investigation of Senator McCarthy of the First Army area was a duplication of your work or an infringement upon it, to any extent?

Secretary STEVENS. No, I didn't feel that way about it.

Mr. JENKINS. So as of October 1, the date of the retention of Mr. Adams, you had never requested a suspension of either an investigation or a hearing?

Secretary STEVENS. As far as I know, I never had.

Mr. JENKINS. What is your—now, Mr. Stevens, you say—as far as you know. Can you give this committee a direct answer to that question?

Secretary STEVENS. I think I can assure this committee that I did not do that.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, now, as I understand you a little while ago, your answer was positive, and it was in the negative, and now are you saying that it is your best recollection that you had not done it; or are you saying that you don't remember?

Secretary STEVENS. I am saying that I just don't think I did any such thing, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. You just don't think you did any such thing?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, Mr. Secretary, when did you first ask either Senator McCarthy, or any member of his staff, to please suspend the operations, their operations, in the investigation of Fort Monmouth or the First Army area; and when was your first request made?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think that I ever did exactly do that.

Mr. JENKINS. You say now, this morning, that you never did request a suspension of the McCarthy investigations?

Secretary STEVENS. Never requested a suspension of the investigation, that is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. Maybe I misunderstood you heretofore, Mr. Secretary, and I am not going into details, and I am not going to read the record, because the committee will remember what your testimony is and I could be in error about it.

Very well, Mr. Adams did come to you and was on your staff as of October 1?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. And one of his duties was to establish a better relationship between you and the committee, wasn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I think that I had a fine relationship with the committee. Mr. Adams' job was to help me maintain it and carry it on.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, if your relationship with the committee as of October 1 was fine, and had not deteriorated, and you had no complaints, then why was there any necessity to bring in another man?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Jenkins, the answer to that one is that as Secretary of the Army, I have a terrific number of duties and responsibilities.

Mr. JENKINS. I appreciate that fact, of course.

Secretary STEVENS. Which extend worldwide to the largest department the United States Government has, and it is a terrific task to carry.

The liaison work with the committee was naturally a time-consuming one, and I had carried it from its inception from the 8th of September through the month of September, and when Mr. Adams came I had to relieve myself of that in order to carry on the other parts of my job.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Secretary, you were asked, and I think I remember your answer, whether or not when Mr. Adams came to you on October 1 you specifically asked him to use his offices with the McCarthy committee to bring about a cessation or a suspension.

Secretary STEVENS. I did not do that.

Mr. JENKINS. That is your answer now, and as I recall your answer heretofore has been that you had no recollection of it and didn't remember. Now your memory has been refreshed after meditating over the question, and you say now definitely and positively that you did not ask Mr. Adams to do that?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, what in your opinion is the meaning of espionage?

Secretary STEVENS. Spying.

Mr. JENKINS. Is there a distinction between a spy and a subversive, a bad security risk? There is, is there not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. In your press release, I believe of November 13, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. From the Pentagon?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You stated to the press that there was no current espionage in the Army.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. I had no evidence of any current espionage at Fort Monmouth, that is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Was that your statement?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You made no statement at that time or at any other time with respect to whether or not there were bad security risks in the Army; is that correct? And particularly at Fort Monmouth?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't know whether I ever made any public statement. I know that—

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know whether or not on November 13 you made any reference to subversives or bad security risks?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, the whole question of Fort Monmouth and espionage, and security risks, that was all pretty fully covered, Mr. Jenkins, in that press conference.

Mr. JENKINS. I understand that, but heretofore your testimony has been confined exclusively to spies, espionage.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, did you go further at that press conference of November 13, and say that there was not only no espionage at Fort Monmouth, but that there were no subversives or doubtful or poor security risks?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You did not go that far?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I didn't go that far.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well. You understood—strike the question—

Mr. Secretary, is it not your opinion that the investigation, the detection, the apprehension, the exposure, the expulsion of subversives, poor security risks, is quite important as well as the detection of spies?

Secretary STEVENS. Oh, extremely important; yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And you have always so regarded it, and so regard it now?

Secretary STEVENS. From my first day in office, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, sir. As of October 1, 1953, how many subversives or poor security risks have been dismissed from the Army, and particularly Fort Monmouth, as a result of the efforts of the Army exclusive of any supplemental or additional work done by the McCarthy committee?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I just don't have that information.

Mr. JENKINS. You don't have that information?

Secretary STEVENS. Not in my head. And I think perhaps this report on Fort Monmouth cases, which I will read, whenever you want me to, sir, may give some light on that question.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, as we understand it, there were 35 suspensions in all, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know how many suspensions resulted exclusively, during the fall or early winter of 1953, resulted exclusively from the investigations and work of the McCarthy committee?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I don't.

Mr. JENKINS. Were there any?

Secretary STEVENS. I testified, and—is this thing working all right?

Mr. JENKINS. I hear you; I am sure the committee does.

Secretary STEVENS. I testified that with respect to certain cases there, that I was sure that the McCarthy committee had expedited the handling of those cases by the Army to a certain extent.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand it, you made that in your written statement which you read to the committee, and you further testified to that.

Secretary STEVENS. I testified to it; yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Secretary, it is essential to the national security and safety that subversives and bad risks be taken out of an important area such as Forth Monmouth, isn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And to the extent that Senator McCarthy and his staff expedited the suspension of that class of persons, his committee rendered a valuable service to the Nation, did it not?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. And you have no thought or intention of minimizing the importance of that work?

Secretary STEVENS. I do not.

Mr. JENKINS. The character of the work is such that time is of the very essence; that is correct, isn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Was it before all of these 35 suspensions were effectuated that you sought to obtain a suspension of the McCarthy work?

Secretary STEVENS. May I have that read, please?

(The question was read by the reporter.)

Secretary STEVENS. As I say, I never attempted to get a suspension of the investigation. I did want the type of hearing that was being

held suspended or changed. Most of those suspensions, Mr. Jenkins, took place during the months of October and November, as I recall.

Mr. JENKINS. In short, there were suspensions as a result of the committee's work after you had sought to bring about suspensions of the investigations in the area?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't know that I can answer that.

Mr. JENKINS. You cannot answer that?

Secretary STEVENS. No.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, passing from that and getting back momentarily to G. David Schine who was inducted into the Army, as we understand, on November 3—

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. And who, I believe, you say was not in uniform and not on the post until November 10.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. And about whom you say you have no recollection now with reference to whether or not you invited him to the Pentagon with Senator McCarthy, Roy Cohn, and others on November 6.

Secretary STEVENS. I think those arrangement were probably made by my staff, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Would your staff have invited a then private in the United States Army to attend a luncheon given by you in the Pentagon unless you had so directed?

Secretary STEVENS. We would have been glad to have anybody from the staff over there, including Schine, if he were there on committee business.

Mr. JENKINS. After November 10, the date he reported for active duty, did it come to your attention, Mr. Secretary, that this private in the Army was getting special preferential treatment at Fort Dix?

Secretary STEVENS. It did thereafter, yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Did it come to your attention that he was not doing his proper quota of KP duty?

Secretary STEVENS. Not for a long, long time.

Mr. JENKINS. But it did come to your attention during his period of training there that that was occurring?

Secretary STEVENS. I do not know whether I had the information about the KP during the period he was there or not. I do not think I did.

Mr. JENKINS. Did it come to your attention that he was not wearing the uniform which was issued by the Army to draftees and inductees?

Secretary STEVENS. I did not know it at the time. I found it out later.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you later learn that?

Secretary STEVENS. I later learned that.

Mr. JENKINS. Did it come to your attention—

Secretary STEVENS. That is, I learned it not of my own knowledge.

Mr. JENKINS. We understand that.

You knew while he was still at Fort Dix?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I am not sure that I did.

Mr. JENKINS. Are you sure that you did not?

Secretary STEVENS. I cannot remember exactly what date.

Senator MUNDT. Will you pull the microphone a little closer to you? It would be more convenient for you. It is working, but if you will pull it toward you a little closer, it would be helpful.

Mr. JENKINS. Did it come to your attention that this private, David Schine, was hiring his fellow soldiers and paying them money to clean his rifle?

Secretary STEVENS. I think I heard something about that later.

Mr. JENKINS. You knew that was against regulations.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, I certainly know that.

Mr. JENKINS. Did it come to your attention that he was not cleaning up his quarters, such as other soldiers were required to do according to regulations?

Secretary STEVENS. Not while he was at Fort Dix, but I heard about it afterwards.

Mr. JENKINS. You heard about it afterwards?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did it come to your attention that he was having an unusually large number of leaves and absences while at Fort Dix?

Secretary STEVENS. I testified about that, yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. I believe you say in your statement that he had 15 in an 8-week period, including leaves of absences embracing 2 or 3 days; whereas, the average private had only 3, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is approximately correct, yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did it come to your attention that this private was taking unusual liberties with the officers, would sometimes put his arm around a commissioned officer and fraternize with him and talk to him as though he were his equal in rank or superior?

Secretary STEVENS. That one I do not think I ever heard, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You never heard that?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir. I don't recall that.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you ever hear that this private called Lieutenant Miller—he was the company commander, was he not?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall the name.

Mr. JENKINS. You do not recall the name?

Secretary STEVENS. Of the commander, no.

Mr. JENKINS. That this private on one occasion while at Fort Dix put his arm around Lieutenant Miller and drew him to one side and told him that he was there on a special assignment; to wit, had been sent there to modernize the American Army and streamline it along modern lines. [Laughter.] Did you know that?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You never heard that before?

Secretary STEVENS. I think I heard later, along with these other points that you have been making, some reference to something along that line, but not in any such all-embracing language as that was.

Senator POTTER. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Potter, a point of order.

Senator POTTER. The point of order I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is, when did the Army change so much in the last 10 years? I had never known that type of treatment to be tendered.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair will have to rule that is a private point of order, not a public one. We cannot entertain it.

Senator McCarthy, do you have a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. A point of order or something. I understand the Inspector General has investigated all of these matters mentioned by counsel and has come up with a report. I think that report should

be made a part of the record; otherwise, I am afraid the questions will be taken to mean that the facts have been established.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, Senator McCarthy's time to cross-examine and develop that fact will come soon.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, may I request at this time that in view of all the reports that apparently Mr. Stevens has been able to present, he should present now the Inspector General's report upon the special consideration that this private got. That report is available. It is in his possession and it should be put in the record.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, that may be done at the proper time, and now is not the proper time during my cross-examination of the Secretary.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair holds that that is an appropriate question for Senator McCarthy to ask Mr. Stevens on his own time.

Senator McCARTHY. Very well.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Do you have a point of order, Mr. Welch?

Mr. WELCH. It seems to me it would be appropriate for Mr. Jenkins to say that the Army has made available to him and his staff such portions of that report as are complete. Would you mind doing that for us, Mr. Jenkins?

Mr. JENKINS. And from that date I gleaned my alleged facts upon which I am now basing my cross-examination.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Proceed, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, the weather during the months of November, December, and January was extremely severe, was it not?

Secretary STEVENS. I do not know, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You do not know about that. Did you know—

Secretary STEVENS. I know the 1 day I was there, it was all right.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you know that when the soldiers at Fort Dix were transported from one point in the area to another, to bivouac and other points, Private Schine almost invariably rode in the cab of the truck; whereas, the other soldiers, sometimes numbering 40 and 50, were packed like cattle or sheep in the bed of the truck and exposed to the weather? Did you learn that?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I never heard that.

Mr. JENKINS. Is this the first time you have ever heard of that?

Secretary STEVENS. It is the first time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, have you ever, before or since the inception of this investigation, talked to the officers, the noncoms and the privates—

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Senator MUNDT. State your point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. I am not the counsel for Mr. Schine. I do have an interest, however, in seeing that no young man, no private in the Army, is smeared without a right to answer. I think it is highly improper to ask questions here assuming certain facts not in evidence, facts not made available to us, when counsel, for whom I think all of us have a great deal of respect, says, "Have you learned that such and such was the fact?" The millions of people watching this television are going to assume it is a fact.

Mr. JENKINS. I must state, Mr. Chairman—

Senator McCARTHY. Let me finish my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Finish your point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. I have a duty to protect the young men who worked on this staff. If Mr. Schine did something improper, then let's have the facts brought out when he is here and he is available. Let's make him a party to this circus, if we will. I think it is highly improper. Let me finish, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

I think it is highly improper to ask the Secretary, "Have you learned this? Have you learned that?" The assumption is that the facts are accurate. I do not agree that they are accurate. I do not know. Mr. Schine should be here if we are going to make him a party to this smear that has been going on.

Senator JACKSON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair say that Mr. Schine will be called in due course as a witness.

Mr. JENKINS. Right.

Senator MUNDT. The counsel, as the Chair understands it, is trying to determine from Mr. Stevens whether or not he has any knowledge about these alleged facts.

Senator Jackson has a point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. May I finish my point of order? You say Mr. Schine will be called in due course. If there are charges made against Mr. Schine, then he should be notified of those charges. He should be notified to come here with counsel and be permitted to cross-examine. Otherwise, it is completely unfair to this young man. As I say, I don't know whether those charges are true or false. For the first time today I hear them stated as matters of fact by counsel.

I have asked for the report. I have asked for the report from Mr. Adams on whether or not Mr. Schine had received any special consideration. Up to this time the only place where I can find the charges made public are in the New York Post and in the columns and in the left-wing columns like Drew Pearson. If those charges haven't been investigated, I think Mr. Schine should have a copy of the report.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of clarity and to keep the record straight, I think it should be pointed out that from the very beginning a number of hypothetical questions have been put without the requirement of evidence to substantiate those questions.

I recall a hypothetical question that was put with reference to Fort Monmouth at the very first day, on Thursday, and there have been a number of hypothetical questions put to various witnesses, without the previous requirement of testimony.

Do I understand, and this is a point of order—do I understand that we have the right to put those hypothetical questions, and if not, then I assume that all of the previous hypothetical questions put by all members of this committee and counsel will be stricken?

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman—

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has ruled throughout in response to both of the points of order—the Chair has the floor, I am sorry—the Chair has ruled throughout in response to both of these points of order and has ruled throughout on previous ones that all this committee is seeking to do is to endeavor to decide the truth, and to find it out, and that any questions asked by counsel for either side, by members of the committee, that can shed some light on what the truth is in this controversy, will be permissible and acceptable.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman—

Senator MUNDT. Have you a further point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes, I certainly have. When Senator Jackson refers to a question as a hypothetical question, I make a point of order that when counsel says, "Have you learned that as many as 40 young men were packed in the back end of a truck like cattle," that that is not a hypothetical question; that is completely unfair to the Army, and I don't think, and I have been in the military for a while, and I never have seen young men treated like cattle, and I know that counsel—I have a great deal of respect for counsel—and I think he has been doing an excellent job. I do think, however, when I find that he is in my opinion making a grievous error, I must bring it to the attention of the Chair. And I don't think that we should let it go on to the mothers of this country that their sons are being treated like cattle, because they are not.

Senator JACKSON. As I recall, a hypothetical and a very realistic question was put with reference to Sam Reber, which I do not recall there was any evidence offered in this hearing, as to the allegations contained in those charges.

I just want to know what the procedure is so that I can better understand the questions that I have a proper right to frame. It is to that point of order that I addressed myself.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Jackson will recall that the procedure then and the procedure now was to admit questions which might remotely shed some light on deciding the truth of this very difficult controversy.

Senator SYMINGTON. A point of order, please.

Mr. Chairman, I am not always agreed with the counsel in these hearings. But I want to be the first to say that I do not think he is making any deliberate effort to smear anybody.

Mr. JENKINS. Thank you, sir.

May I proceed?

Senator McCLELLAN. I do not have a point of order; I want to make an observation on the points that have been made.

The testimony being elicited is absolutely relevant to the charges of whether Private Schine received preferential treatment. There can be no question about their relevancy.

However, if Private Schine feels that he, because of this evidence and because of the statements that are being made, or the report that has been submitted, is a party to this action, to these proceedings, he should be given the right just as Mr. Hensel, was, after charges were made against him, he should be given the right to intervene if he desires to do so.

As to the questions, they are proper on the issue of whether preferential treatment was sought or granted for Private Schine.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman—

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy, have you a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. A further point of order, Mr. Chairman. I may say I think Senator McClellan is absolutely right. However, in the case of Mr. Hensel, the charges were given to him, and he was given a chance to answer. And I don't know what Mr. Schine's answer would be.

I think the record should be clear. And I know Mr. Jenkins knows this: That Mr. Schine was interrogated by the Inspector General's Department. And he was ordered not to discuss the charges with anyone; as a result he could not tell me what the charges were. And he was denied the right to have counsel present.

And now I think, if charges as serious as are being made today, and I know Mr. Jenkins is completely honest and sincere about it, and I don't question his honesty at all, but I do think that if we are going to start making public charges of this nature, then the charges should be filed upon Mr. Schine the same as they are filed upon Mr. Hensel, and Mr. Adams, and on me, and upon Mr. Carr and Mr. Cohn.

He should know what they are, and he should be given the same right to cross-examine and the same right of counsel as anyone else, because those charges are gravely serious that are being repeated today.

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation with respect to that. Those were pretty serious charges the Senator made against General Reber's brother, and no charges were filed. They were developed in testimony, just as this is being developed.

Senator McCARTHY. If General Reber's brother wants to come here—

Senator McCLELLAN. I took the same position with respect to General Reber's brother. He should be invited, if he wanted to, to appear and deny it.

Senator McCARTHY. I certainly agree with Senator McClellan.

Senator MUNDT. And the Chair has gone further in connection with Private Schine, and he has stated publicly, on a number of occasions, that, if neither Mr. Stevens nor those associated with him, nor Senator McCarthy or those associated with him, calls Mr. Schine, then the committee will call him as a matter of elemental justice because certainly he has a right to be heard in his own behalf.

And he will have a right to have counsel and, of course, will have the same rights of cross-examination.

Senator McCARTHY. I don't want to take, Mr. Chairman, any more time on this. But there is a big difference between calling a young man as a witness days after charges are made against him and notifying him of the charges.

But, as the Chair well knows, we have a hard and fast rule in this committee, and we followed it now since I have been chairman, and it is a rule that the present acting chairman, I think, has heartily approved of, and that is this:

May I have the Chair's attention?

That no man is publicly accused unless he is in the committee room and allowed to step up and answer.

Now I think that is a good rule, and I think we should follow that here.

Senator JACKSON. Then why wasn't—

Mr. Chairman, why wasn't it followed on the very first day with reference to General Reber's brother?

Mr. JENKINS. May I make my position clear, Mr. Chairman? And I think perhaps it will satisfy everybody, including the contesting litigants, I hope.

My position in this line of cross-examination and the purpose of it is this: A charge has been made by Mr. Stevens and Mr. Adams that the McCarthy committee sought preferential treatment for Schine. I am now in this line of cross-examination for the purpose of showing the truth or falsity of that statement, and my theory being that if he were accorded preferential treatment it is some evidence that an effort was made on his behalf for that. That is No. 1.

No. 2, a countercharge has been made against Mr. Stevens and Mr. Adams to the effect that they held, in effect, Schine as a hostage, as a bait from time to time, for the purpose of stopping Senator McCarthy's committee from continuing the investigation of Fort Monmouth.

It is, therefore, a double-edged sword, tending to prove the truth or falsity of both charges. And, in my opinion, it does not necessarily reflect on Private Schine.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair will rule that the questions are in order, and that we are proceeding as best we can to elicit the information we require and he has publicly announced that Private Schine will be called in this hearing. And he is entitled to counsel, Senator McCarthy.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, if counsel in asking these questions will say, "Have you learned that it was charged," instead of saying, "Have you learned that men were crowded like cattle in the back end of a truck?" I don't think the Inspector General—let me finish, please—I don't think the Inspector General has reported that young men were crowded into the back end of a truck like cattle. I think counsel should rephrase the question.

Mr. JENKINS. I have no objection to that.

Senator MUNDT. The point of order is upheld.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I hadn't finished.

Senator MUNDT. The chairman is perfectly willing that it be rephrased.

Senator McCARTHY. I insist on the right of finishing a sentence. May I do that, please?

Senator MUNDT. I thought you had asked him to rephrase the question and he said he would do that.

Senator McCARTHY. I think this is important enough, Mr. Chairman, so that I have a right to finish a sentence.

Senator MUNDT. I am trying to expedite the hearing. Is it satisfactory if he rephrases the question?

Senator McCARTHY. Very well.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, you understand that in my examination of you along this line, I am not assuming or stating that the hypothesis of my question is true. You understand that, do you not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand your answers, you have answered in the affirmative with respect to some of my questions, and with respect to some of them you said you had never heard of such a thing.

Secretary STEVENS. That is true.

Mr. JENKINS. Let it be understood that I was not at Fort Dix in November, December, or January, and I have no personal knowledge of the truth or falsity of the basis of these questions. We understand that.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you, Mr. Secretary, whether or not it came to your attention that Private Schine allegedly used the telephone or telephones at Fort Dix for the purpose of calling out other parties away from the fort, and particularly in New York City? Did you learn that, Mr. Secretary, or were you reliably informed that such facts existed? That he was allowed to leave his post of duty and go and use the telephones wherever they might be located, from time to time, an inordinately large number of times? Did you learn that?

Secretary STEVENS. I learned later that he used the phone, but I don't know how many times, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you learn that allegedly Private Schine from time to time called a girl friend in New York City from the telephones at Fort Dix, that he allegedly did so and did so sometimes as many as four times a day? Did you learn that?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I didn't know about that.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you learn—Mr. Secretary, I believe you have stated by way of an overall question that you did learn and knew from time to time that some special privilege or treatment was accorded Private Schine at Fort Dix; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Jenkins, I feel as if I should make a statement, a little short one.

Mr. JENKINS. You may answer it and then give any explanation you desire to give.

Secretary STEVENS. May I have it read, please?

(Whereupon, the question was read by the reporter as above recorded.)

Secretary STEVENS. Not during most of the time that he was there, Mr. Jenkins. I heard about all what you are talking about here afterward. My instructions to General Ryan as commanding general of the Fort Dix Post was a simple command, but it turned out to be a very difficult one to carry out. It was this: that Private Schine was to be made available for committee work, work of this committee, and for no other purpose, provided it did not interfere with his training. That was the instruction that I gave to General Ryan.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you know that Private Schine had the long weekend off just prior to Christmas?

Secretary STEVENS. I have heard that since.

Mr. JENKINS. Beginning Friday evening and extending until Sunday night at bedtime?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir, I learned about that since.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you further know that prior to that, Private Schine had the long weekend during Thanksgiving?

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman—

Secretary STEVENS. I have learned it since.

Mr. JENKINS. That he allegedly had.

I beg your pardon, Senator.

Senator MUNDT. Do you have a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes. I have a very important point of order. I made the point that counsel should not testify to facts that are in dispute. May I finish? When counsel—he has been doing it now constantly. I know it is inadvertent. I know the pressure counsel is under. But when counsel says, "Did you know, did you learn certain facts were in existence?" that means that he is in effect saying

they were in existence. The only thing the Secretary could have learned was that charges to that effect were made.

Mr. JENKINS. I accept the point of order. I was perhaps in error in leaving out the word "allegedly." I will try to conform to that hereafter.

You did learn, as I understand it, that Private Schine allegedly took off the long weekend during the Thanksgiving period?

Secretary STEVENS. I learned that later, yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you whether or not it was the rule at the fort, Fort Dix, that half of the personnel would take off the weekend of Thanksgiving and would remain on duty the weekend of Christmas, and the other half would remain on duty during the Thanksgiving weekend and take off during Christmas? Is that or not the fact?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't know, sir. I couldn't testify on that. I would have to check.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know whether or not Private Schine—and I don't assume that he did or didn't—do you know that he took the long weekend off during the New Year holiday?

Secretary STEVENS. I heard later that he was off.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, I will ask you whether or not General Ryan, who was the commanding officer at Fort Dix, as we understand it, communicated with you by telephone or otherwise from time to time with reference to Private Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think he did, no, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know whether or not he communicated with Mr. Adams?

Secretary STEVENS. He did.

Mr. JENKINS. You were so informed by Mr. Adams?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. About these unusual number of leaves and passes? Was that it?

Secretary STEVENS. I knew—I heard that General Ryan was having difficulty with the case of Private Schine. I didn't hear any of the details that have been referred to here this morning, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know whether or not Mr. Adams, by way of appeasement of the committee, countermanded certain orders of General Ryan and directed General Ryan to permit this special treatment for Private Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I don't know that.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know that Mr. Adams did tell General Ryan to permit these passes, these weekends, and so forth?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I don't know that.

Mr. JENKINS. For whatever purpose he might have done it, do you know that?

Secretary STEVENS. No, I don't.

Mr. JENKINS. Did Mr. Adams ever communicate such a thing to you if it did happen?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Adams told me from time to time that he had talked with General Ryan or one of the staff down there at Dix, but I had a very limited knowledge of these things that you are talking about until a long time after they happened.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, these special dispensations for Schine, if there were any at Fort Dix, or at any other place, were they or not accorded him for the purpose of appeasing Senator McCarthy and an

attempt to dissuade him from the further investigation of the infiltration of bad risks at Fort Monmouth?

Secretary STEVENS. Absolutely and completely not. My instruction was that Private Schine was to be made available for committee work, and for committee work alone, provided it did not interfere with his training. That was a simple instruction and it was difficult to carry out, and it had absolutely nothing to do with appeasement or anything else in connection with this committee except to make him available for committee work if the committee needed him.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, you have testified at length with reference to an alleged explosion on the part of Mr. Cohn at Fort Monmouth, on October 20.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And you have detailed reports given to you by officers and other personnel, at Fort Dix, on October 20; that is correct, isn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And you have told about a statement you made in the presence of some 20-odd men to Mr. Cohn on that occasion whether it be construed as an apology or not. Now, I ask you this question, Mr. Secretary: To tell this committee whether or not on October 21, the day after the Fort Monmouth incident in which Mr. Cohn's name has been connected, whether or not on the succeeding day, October 21, you called David Schine for any purpose?

Secretary STEVENS. My recollection is that he called me.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, where were you when he called you?

Secretary STEVENS. In my office.

Mr. JENKINS. Where was he, Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't know where he was. I think he was in New York.

Mr. JENKINS. What was the purpose of that call, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. I can't recall all of the details of it, but I think that I could sum it up by saying that David Schine was not happy about his forthcoming induction.

Mr. JENKINS. And is your recollection clear as to whether you called him or whether he called you?

Secretary STEVENS. My recollection is pretty clear that he called me, and in fact I am certain of that.

Mr. JENKINS. You are now certain of it?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And this prospective inductee who was not then in the Armed forces, you say, called you, the Secretary of the Army, the highest ranking officer in the Army, from New York City on October 21, because, as you say, he was not happy over his prospects of being inducted; is that what you are saying, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. I think that about sums it up, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Wasn't that most unusual for a citizen, a private citizen to whom you were not obligated?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, Mr. Jenkins—

Mr. JENKINS. To call the highest officer in the Army, and take up your valuable time and tell you that he wasn't happy about the

prospects of being inducted, and is that what your recollection is, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. That is my recollection. I must recall, however, to you, that the week previously, on the 14th of October when I was in New York, that I had quite a discussion with David Schine riding downtown with him in his car, and that I had attempted to get over to David Schine the opportunity that was really his to come into this Army and serve his country.

Mr. JENKINS. And it was after this call, alleged call, from Schine to you, from New York City, on October 21, that you gave your luncheon in the Pentagon on November 6; that is correct, isn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. And as I recall the burden of your statement, it was and is that you do not know and will not now tell this committee whether or not on November 6 you included David Schine as one of your guests?

Secretary STEVENS. I think the arrangements were made by members of my staff and I cannot testify on exactly who was invited. Of course I knew that Senator McCarthy and Mr. Cohn were coming and I think I knew that Mr. Carr was coming; and whether Dave Schine or any other member of the staff might have been invited, I don't actually know at this time.

Mr. JENKINS. It is alleged that during that luncheon, on November 6, there was a vacant chair at the table, and that you expressed great regret that Schine had not been able to attend.

What is your recollection on that, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall a vacant chair.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you recall whether or not you said you regretted that Schine wasn't there as a guest?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall that; I don't recall having made any such statement.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, what is your best recollection about it?

Secretary STEVENS. My best recollection is that I did not, but I cannot positively say I didn't.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, now at the request of this committee, I now ask you, Mr. Secretary, to read into the record the report you were about to read before I began what I hope is my final cross-examination of the Secretary.

Senator MUNDT. The Secretary may read the report.

Secretary STEVENS. This is headed, Mr. Chairman, "Fort Monmouth Cases."

Senator McCLELLAN. Do we all have copies of that? I had one here a moment ago, and have copies been provided for all members?

Senator MUNDT. No copies have been provided for the Chair, I might add.

Mr. JENKINS. Might I ask one other question?

Senator JACKSON. I understand there is just one copy, and I was informed by the clerk of the committee that there was only one copy.

Senator MUNDT. Very well.

Secretary STEVENS. We have other copies, and I don't know how many, but here is one here and I will be glad to make it available to you.

Senator MUNDT. If they are available, would you have one of your aides send it to the committee?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think we have enough for all members but we will provide that for you.

Mr. JENKINS. I have one other question, Mr. Secretary.

Have you seen, read, or examined a written statement which has been filed by counsel, Mr. Adams, which was filed either yesterday morning or the day before that, and have you seen that, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. Adams has written a statement consisting of 40 pages, which he has filed with this committee.

Secretary STEVENS. No, I don't.

Mr. WELCH. Will you give us a moment in respect to that? I wish to confer with Mr. St. Clair.

Mr. JENKINS. Certainly.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Jenkins, Mr. St. Clair informs me that the paper or document which you refer to was handed to you, sir, as an aid in examining Mr. Adams, and it is expected that Mr. Adams' testimony will be all what you and I call Q and A, meaning question and answer.

Mr. JENKINS. And that it will not be read?

Mr. WELCH. That is my present understanding, sir, that Mr. Adams will testify Q and A and make no prepared statement; and the paper handed to you, sir, was in the nature of a lawyer's tool from which he could work in examining the witness.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair understands that this 40-page statement which he was about to have the screening committee read, is not to be read by Mr. Adams and was not submitted in conformity with the 24-hour rule.

Mr. WELCH. That is my understanding.

Senator MUNDT. Thank you.

Mr. JENKINS. Is there not, Mr. Welch, is it your understanding that it would be improper in view of the circumstances under which this 40-page statement was left with me, for me to use it as a basis for a short further cross examination of the Secretary?

Mr. WELCH. I would not think it improper, sir, and I only thought it fair to point out the purpose for which the paper was handed to you.

Senator MUNDT. Counsel may proceed.

Mr. WELCH. I don't know whether or not this witness read it after it was prepared or not.

Senator MUNDT. The question is directed to the Secretary for the purpose of finding out, I think, whether he had read it or not.

Secretary STEVENS. I have not.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Do you have a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. It is not a point of order, but it is an important question. You are talking about a 40-page statement which I haven't seen.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair would explain that a 40-page statement was submitted to the Chair yesterday by the counsel in the belief that Mr. Adams was submitting it in conformity with the 24-hour rule, to be read, and he and we have talked to Senator McClellan and Senator McClellan and I, in council, are supposed to read all of these statements in advance; and we find out it is not necessary to read it in advance, and it is not a statement that Mr. Adams expects to read.

This is information that he has submitted to the counsel, as both sides have been submitting information to the counsel, to enable him better to do his direct and cross-examination.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask you one other question, Mr. Stevens, please, sir, and that is this: whether or not this statement is true, being a written statement on the part of Mr. Adams—

On November 18, General Ryan telephoned me from Fort Dix and stated that he had a request from the subcommittee staff for a long weekend pass for Schine which he intended to refuse. I talked to the Secretary on the matter, and Mr. Stevens stated that since we had just succeeded in patching up the press conference irritation and since Schine's 8-week training cycle had not yet commenced, he felt that it would be better in the interest of cooperation with the committee to make Schine available on this occasion. I so advised General Ryan.

Do you recall that incident, and if so, state whether or not that is true.

Secretary STEVENS. May I ask, who contacted General Ryan? Does it say there?

Mr. JENKINS. General Ryan telephoned, according to this portion of the statement, Mr. Adams and told Mr. Adams that Schine had made a request for a long weekend pass and that he, Ryan, was going to refuse it, Ryan being the commanding general at Fort Dix, Mr. Adams says—I am leaving out the word "allegedly" now—in this statement that he talked to you and that you in effect told him to countermand Ryan's order for reasons you stated, and let this boy off on the long weekend. Did that or not happen?

Secretary STEVENS. I remember something about that, Mr. Jenkins, but it was related to committee business. I never under any circumstances gave any O. K. for anything in respect to David Schine during his experience at Fort Dix except on the basis of committee business and without interfering with his training.

Mr. JENKINS. Are you finished, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. But, Mr. Secretary, my specific question is this: Did General Ryan in a conversation with your office, Mr. Adams, state that he was going to refuse the request of Schine for a long weekend pass, and did you countermand that order in effect by telling Adams to tell Ryan to let him off?

Secretary STEVENS. Of course, I was not on the telephone with General Ryan, so I do not know exactly what Ryan said.

Mr. JENKINS. But did you tell Adams to tell Ryan to reverse his position and let this boy off?

Secretary STEVENS. I am sure that if I did that, I said provided it was in connection with the business of this committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Stevens, that is all, and I now ask you at the request of the committee to read your report. First, identify specifically what it is, what it contains, and then you may read it to the committee.

Secretary STEVENS. It is a short report which carries the heading, "Fort Monmouth Cases," gotten up in response to the question of Senator Jackson.

Mr. JENKINS. Prepared by whom, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. It was prepared by members of my staff. I can identify them to you if you want that information. I do not have it right at the moment myself. Shall I proceed?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, Mr. Secretary, you may proceed.

Secretary STEVENS (reading) :

As I have previously indicated, 35 Fort Monmouth employees have been suspended since August 19, 1953. Of these, 33 had been suspended by October 30. The present status of these 35 cases is as follows:

Restored to duty with full security clearance : 1.

Restored to nonsensitive duties pending further investigations : 9.

Resigned : 3.

Still under suspension : 22.

Of the 22 cases still under suspension, 16 have been heard by the First Army Security Hearing Board and these cases have been forwarded or are in process of being forwarded to the Office of the Secretary of the Army for final disposition. Two categories of such cases will be reviewed by the Security Review Board, namely, cases in which a favorable determination was reached by the Hearing Board and cases where the Hearing Board reached an unfavorable determination and in which the employee has requested a further review by the Security Review Board. (Where the Hearing Board reached an unfavorable determination and the employee has not requested a review by the Security Review Board, a decision will be made in the Office of the Secretary of the Army whether or not to accept the recommendation of the Hearing Board.)

The remaining 6 cases out of the 22 are still to be heard. It is anticipated that the First Army Security Hearing Board will dispose of all these six cases during the next month.

An analysis of the charges issued to the employees still under suspension discloses that in each case more than one item of derogatory information was reported. The allegations made against the 22 individuals range in severity from reported, although unsubstantiated, past membership in the Communist Party (1 of those 2 cases involved activity occurring in 1933-34) to violation of security regulations and to activities of the employee's relatives indicating possible Communist sympathy on the part of such relatives. Some of the types of information that have been reported are set forth below. It must be remembered that in many of these cases the reliability of the informants is unknown and their information has not been substantiated.

(a) Past membership in organizations cited by the Attorney General as Communist or subversive.

(b) Association or affiliation with persons who have been active in the Communist Party or in organizations cited by the Attorney General.

(c) Activity, membership, or affiliation with organizations, including political parties, which have been reported to be Communist dominated or controlled.

(d) Association with relatives who have been reported to be active in Communist affairs.

(e) Signing Communist Party nominating petitions or other petitions sponsored by Communists.

(f) Subscriptions to the Daily Worker or other Communist publications.

It may be of interest to relate the actions taken by the Army in the 35 cases under discussion by the committee. Of the 35 employees involved, 25 were interrogated by the committee. Of these 25, the suspensions had occurred in the following order:

August 19—1.

September 29—4. An additional employee who was not called by the committee was also suspended on September 29.

October—19.

February—1.

A total of 25.

None of the individuals who were employed at Fort Monmouth at the time they were called before the committee invoked the fifth amendment.

With respect to the 19 employees who were suspended during the month of October, the Army already had derogatory information in every case sufficient to be the basis for suspension. These 19 cases, in common with many others, were in the process of reexamination as required by President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953. Insofar as the results of committee interrogations of these 19 individuals have been made available to the Army, no significant item of derogatory information was developed by the committee which was not already known to and being acted upon. In one additional case, the committee did develop certain derogatory information of a minor nature which was not known to the Army at that time. The suspension which occurred in

that single case was based upon information already available in Army files, upon a further investigation conducted by the FBI, and upon statements made by that employee before the committee in executive session.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman—

Secretary STEVENS (reading) :

In all these cases and others like them time is consumed, depending upon the degree and accuracy of evidence and regulations and laws under which the Army must operate. In all such cases, however, where derogatory information is sufficient to create a doubt, the employee concerned is immediately either suspended or placed on nonsensitive work and deprived of access to classified information until it is certain that his further employment will not jeopardize the Government. In every instance the investigative work on these cases is, and has been done, by the FBI and/or the Army's Counter Intelligence Corps.

That is the end of the statement.

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy, do you have a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. Not a point of order, but I am not sure whether I heard the Secretary correctly or not, and I wonder if I could just have this cleared up. Was one of the categories that you read, Mr. Secretary, in which you cover those who were suspended for various reasons, did you include in that the removal or thefts of secrets from the radar laboratories? I am not sure if I heard you on that. You read 6 or 7 or 8 different reasons.

Senator MUNDT. Will you provide Senator McCarthy with a copy of the statement, and he will have during the noon hour to read it and object to what was said.

Secretary STEVENS. I think that you have a copy of it there now, Senator.

Senator McCARTHY. May I ask a question?

Senator MUNDT. If it is something you did not hear that you want him to repeat, you may ask it.

Senator McCARTHY. I want to know whether he did, in reading that list, whether one of the categories covered removal of secret material from the radar laboratories.

Mr. JENKINS. That properly comes under the heading of cross-examination, and Senator McCarthy will undoubtedly have his opportunity to do so and to develop that fact.

Senator McCARTHY. Just a moment. I just want to know what he said.

Secretary STEVENS. You have got a copy of the statement.

Senator McCARTHY. Just answer me, Bob.

Secretary STEVENS. Why don't you look at the statement, and I think you can get the answer yourself.

Senator MUNDT. If Senator McCarthy has a copy of the statement—

Senator McCARTHY. I will wait and bring it up on cross-examination.

Senator MUNDT. We are now about as close to 12:30, I believe, as we can come, and we will recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 2:30 p. m., of the same day.)

INDEX

	Page
Adams, John G.....	340-352, 359, 360, 362, 365, 366
Air Force (United States).....	340, 341
American Army (streamline).....	355
Army (United States).....	338-341, 343-345, 348-356, 358, 363, 367, 368
Army Counter Intelligence Corps.....	368
Army report.....	339, 340
Associated Press.....	340
Attorney General (United States).....	367
Back, General.....	342
Belieu, Colonel.....	347
Bell, Jack.....	340
Brother of General Reber.....	359
Carr, Francis P.....	338-340, 359
Christmas (long weekend).....	361, 362
Cohn, Roy M.....	339, 341, 342, 347, 354, 359, 363, 364
Communist Party.....	367
Communists.....	338, 339, 345, 349, 367
Counter Intelligence Corps (United States Army).....	368
Daily Worker (publication).....	367
Defense Department.....	341
Department of the Air Force.....	340, 341
Department of the Army.....	338-341, 343-345, 348-356, 358, 363, 367, 368
Department of Defense.....	341
Department of Justice.....	345
Department of the Navy.....	341
Eisenhower, President.....	367
Executive Order 10450 (Apr. 27, 1953).....	367
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	368
Federal Government.....	341, 351
First Army (United States).....	348-351, 367
First Army security hearing board.....	368
Fort Dix.....	354-356, 360-363, 366
Fort Monmouth.....	344-353, 357, 360, 363, 364, 366, 367
"Fort Monmouth cases".....	347, 364, 366
Government service.....	341
Government of the United States.....	341, 351
Hearing board.....	367
Hensel, H. Struve.....	342, 358
Inspector General's department.....	359, 360
Inspector General's report.....	355, 356
Justice Department.....	345
KP (kitchen police).....	340, 354
Labor Day.....	342
McCarthy, Senator Joe.....	347-348, 350, 353-362, 364, 365, 368
McCarthy committee.....	348, 349, 352, 353, 360
McCarthy investigations.....	351
Meet the Press (television program).....	340
Miller, Lieutenant.....	355
Navy (United States).....	341
New Year holiday (long weekend).....	362
New York.....	341, 357, 361, 363, 364
New York Post.....	357
Pearson, Drew.....	357
Pentagon.....	343, 352, 354, 364
President of the United States.....	367

	Page
Reber, General	340, 342, 359, 361, 362, 366
Reber (brother of General Reber)	359
Reber, Sam	358
St. Clair, Mr.	346, 365
Schine, David	338-364, 366
Secretary of the Army	338-368
Security hearing board (First Army)	368
Security Review Board	367
Stevens, Robert T., testimony of	338-368
Thanksgiving (long weekend)	361, 362
United States Air Force	340, 341
United States Army	338-341, 343-345, 348-356, 358, 363, 367, 368
United States Army Counter Intelligence Corps	368
United States Army report	339, 340
United States Attorney General	367
United States Department of Justice	345
United States First Army	348-351, 367
United States Government	341, 351
United States Government service	341
United States Inspector General's Department	359, 360
United States Inspector General's report	355, 356
United States Navy	341
United States President	367
Young, General	342



